

# **EXHIBIT 2**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
ANDREW COLBORN,  
  
Plaintiff,           CIVIL ACTION NO. 19-CV-0484  
  
-vs-  
  
NETFLIX, INC., ET AL,       \*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*  
  
Defendants.  
-----

DEPOSITION OF:   BRENDA SCHULER  
  
DATE:               May 20, 2022  
  
TIME:               8:39 a.m. to 4:57 p.m.  
  
LOCATION:            Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.  
                      833 East Michigan Street  
                      Suite 1800  
                      Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202  
  
REPORTED BY:       Janet D. Larsen, RPR

## 1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3 SCHOTT BUBLITZ & ENGEL S.C., by  
4 APRIL ROCKSTEAD BARKER, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
640 West Moreland Boulevard  
5 Waukesha, Wisconsin 53188  
abarker@sbe-law.com  
6 appeared via Zoom videoconference on  
behalf of the Plaintiff.

7 BALLARD SPAHR LLP, BY  
8 LEITA WALKER, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
2000 IDS Center  
9 80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
walkerl@ballardspahr.com  
10 appeared on behalf of Netflix, Inc.

11 BALLARD SPAHR LLP, BY  
12 ISABELLA SALOMAO NASCIMENTO  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
2000 IDS Center  
13 80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
14 salomaonascimentoi@ballardspahr.com  
15 appeared via Zoom videoconference on  
behalf of Netflix, Inc.

16 BALLARD SPAHR LLP, by  
17 EMILY S. PARSONS, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
1909 K Street NW, Suite 1200  
18 Washington, DC 20006-1157  
parsonse@ballardspahr.com  
19 appeared via Zoom videoconference on  
behalf of Netflix, Inc.

20 JASSY VICK CAROLAN LLP, by  
21 MEGHAN E. FENZEL, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
KEVIN L. VICK, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
22 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
mfenzel@jassyvick.com  
23 kvick@jassyvick.com  
24 appeared via Zoom videoconference on  
behalf of Chrome Media LLC.

25

1 ANNIGIAN RYAN LLP, by  
2 NICHOLAS A. KURTZ, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
3 114 North Indian Hill Boulevard, Suite E  
4 Claremont, California 91711  
5 nk@arllp.com  
6 appeared on behalf of the Witness.

7  
8 ALSO PRESENT VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE:  
9 Moira Demos  
10 Laura Ricciardi  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 A. Because, I don't know why I said that, I don't  
2 know. And it was because it was my boss from  
3 Transition, I recall that. I, I don't recall, I'm  
4 sorry, I don't recall --

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. -- whether I told her or not.

7 Q. That's fine.

8 So I think you and Ms. Nascimento,  
9 Isabella, talked about a lot of the documents that  
10 Mr. Colborn had already produced to us. And she  
11 may have even mentioned to you that we didn't need  
12 you to reproduce the same documents. Do you  
13 remember that?

14 A. I believe I recall her saying we don't, we're okay  
15 with overlap, we don't have to go through and,  
16 like, sift through and just get the ones that they  
17 have or not have, right.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. She was very helpful with understanding.

20 Q. Do you, did you review Mr. Colborn's documents  
21 before he produced them to us?

22 A. No, no. Oh, wait, I apologize. You mean like the  
23 emails and the texts?

24 Q. M-hm.

25 A. I did, yes.

1 Q. You did.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. So you knew that he was going to give those to us?

4 A. I did.

5 Q. And how did it happen that you reviewed them? Did  
6 he talk to you about it, or did his attorneys  
7 reach out to you or tell me about that?

8 A. If I recall correctly, his attorney, I think it  
9 was April, maybe Debra, somehow set it up with my  
10 boss about it just as a courtesy, I'm sure.

11 Q. Your boss being Shawn Rech?

12 A. Right, Shawn Rech. So somehow there was a  
13 connection between Shawn and April. We had a  
14 short meeting about what this meant exactly. We,  
15 we said, great, we're, you know, we're okay with  
16 it, and they produced them. I reviewed them. I  
17 did go through and review them, all the texts and  
18 whatnot, and sent them out.

19 Q. And there were about 4,000 texts, you remember?

20 A. Yes, yes.

21 Q. So I don't mean to be argumentative but --

22 A. Sure.

23 Q. -- I'm struggling to understand how you had time  
24 to review 4,000 texts for him, but you can't  
25 review another, sounds like easily less than a

- 1           Writer.
- 2    A.    Wrong\_Righter, correct.
- 3    Q.    And that is your user name on, on Reddit?
- 4    A.    Yes.  Reddit, yes, yes, Reddit, yes.
- 5    Q.    And is Wrong\_Righter a reference to, to the work
- 6           you're doing on behalf of Mr. Colborn?
- 7    A.    No, Wrong\_Righter was, when I joined Reddit, I
- 8           created Wrong\_Righter because I, it was nothing to
- 9           do with Colborn, it was to do with Making a
- 10          Murderer overall.
- 11   Q.    Okay.
- 12   A.    I wanted the other side of the truth to be put out
- 13          there so --
- 14   Q.    Okay.  But that first paragraph is essentially
- 15          accurate that you fact checked Mr. Kratz's book
- 16          and serve as a consultant for Mr. Griesbach and
- 17          use the Reddit handle Wrong\_Righter; correct?
- 18   A.    Correct.
- 19   Q.    Were you paid for the work you did for
- 20          Mr. Kratz?
- 21   A.    No.
- 22   Q.    Okay.  And I assume you sort of took on that role
- 23          in the same way you did for Mr. Griesbach, it just
- 24          happened organically over time?
- 25   A.    Probably a little quicker, just because he already

1 A. I'm sorry, could you say that again.

2 Q. Are you anticipating it will cover roughly the  
3 same time period as Making a Murderer so 1985 with  
4 the rape, the exoneration, the murder trial?

5 A. Making a Murderer 1 or Making a Murderer --

6 Q. Your documentary, your documentary.

7 A. Right, right, but I mean are you asking if it's --  
8 Are they gone?

9 MR. KURTZ: It's all right.

10 A. Are you asking, I guess, if ours will cover the  
11 Making a Murderer 1 time frame --

12 Q. Yeah.

13 A. -- or the Making a Murder 1 and 2 with Zellner  
14 time frame?

15 It's post Making a Murderer and Making a  
16 Murderer 2.

17 Q. Just tell me what time frame. That's the easiest  
18 way to ask the question.

19 A. It's basically as far back as we can go on Steven  
20 Avery.

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. Until, gosh. I mean, it -- with -- Yes, through  
23 the same time frame.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. I think that's the easiest way to say it, yes.



1 Q. And then I assume it explores Making a Murderer as  
2 well, the documentary that was released in 2015?

3 A. Sure, yes.

4 Q. Okay. And is it fair to say it aims to correct  
5 the record as you see it and be a count -- I think  
6 I've heard it described as a counter  
7 documentary?

8 A. I think that's fair.

9 Q. And so a rebuttal to Making a Murderer; is that  
10 another way you would describe it?

11 A. I think that's the way it's been described.

12 Q. Would you agree that it tells things more from  
13 Mr. Colborn's perspective?

14 A. Mr. Colborn's? I think it's the full story. It's  
15 not just his side. I mean we interviewed 40 plus  
16 people, so I don't -- I mean I know three things  
17 about his perspective on certain things. I don't  
18 know what you mean, I guess.

19 Q. Do you know if Mr. Colborn was featured in the  
20 trailer?

21 A. I think maybe.

22 Q. You didn't feature all 40 people in the trailer?

23 A. Oh, gosh, no. No, I think when the trailer came  
24 out, we hadn't even interviewed everybody yet.

25 Q. You would consider him a main subject of the

1 documentary, Mr. Colborn?

2 A. Yeah, I, I -- One in ten we'll say, so there's  
3 probably ten that have more time than other  
4 people.

5 Q. There's been a term batted around a lot in this  
6 case so far, protagonist. Do you know what a  
7 protagonist is?

8 A. Refresh my memory. I, I think so.

9 Q. So you've got a protagonist and an antagonist.

10 A. Sure.

11 Q. Does Making a Murderer, does Convicting a Murderer  
12 have a protagonist?

13 A. Explain protagonist.

14 Q. Let me ask you how you would define it.

15 A. I think what you're, what you asked me --

16 Q. There's no wrong answer.

17 A. No, I know, but, yes, I, I think it would be that  
18 they're supportive of Steven Avery's side of the  
19 story, yes, and, yes.

20 Q. Okay. So Steven Avery is the antagonist --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- in your documentary?

23 And law enforcement, including

24 Mr. Colborn, is the protagonist; is that right?

25 A. Yes, yeah.

1 Q. Okay. Do you have any reservations about making a  
2 documentary that has a protagonist and an  
3 antagonist?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Do you think there's anything fundamentally unfair  
6 about that?

7 A. Not if you're sharing what's factual in the trial.  
8 If you're sharing factual information, no, I don't  
9 have any issues with it.

10 Q. And am I correct -- Well, let me just hand you an  
11 exhibit. Some of these I don't necessarily need  
12 to put in front of you --

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. -- but if I don't, my whole system gets out of  
15 order.

16 A. Oh, no, I understand.

17 Q. So we're just going to mark them and keep moving.

18 A. That sounds good.

19 Q. This will be [2033](#).

20 (Exhibit [2033](#) marked for identification)

21 Q. So this is another printout from Reddit; correct,  
22 this Exhibit [2033](#)?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And I apologize, again, it's so small.

25 A. I know, that's okay.

1 Q. And I may have asked this, but when -- This was --  
2 I don't know, I've lost track of time, blame  
3 COVID. This was last fall; right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So we're going on six or eight months here since  
6 this was released; does that sound about right?

7 A. Yes, yes.

8 Q. And when do you expect to release Convicting a  
9 Murderer?

10 A. Our hopes is before year end actually.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Are you waiting to release it until this lawsuit  
14 ends that we're here today to discuss?

15 A. I don't think it's going to be, no, no, not at  
16 all.

17 Q. Is the lawsuit going to be part of Convicting a  
18 Murderer?

19 A. At this point it's a mention.

20 (Discussion off the record)

21 (Exhibit [2037](#) marked for identification)

22 Q. So this is Exhibit [2037](#) you've just been handed.

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. It's an email produced by Mr. Colborn Bates  
25 stamped 4614.

1 Do you see that?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Near the bottom of the first page you're writing  
4 this email, I believe to Mike Griesbach; is that  
5 correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. On January 9th, 2019.

8 Do you see that?

9 A. I do, yes.

10 Q. And you tell Mr. Griesbach, I'm traveling to  
11 Cleveland for a week next Tuesday, and we will be  
12 discussing how to proceed with filming since the  
13 defamation lawsuit wasn't initially taken into  
14 account. I foresee Shawn -- That's Mr. Rech?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. -- wanting to follow it and perhaps obtain some  
17 type of behind the scenes access. I'd like to get  
18 your thoughts on that, too, as you'd be part of  
19 it, that's the route, if that's the route Shawn  
20 wanted to take.

21 Did I read that correctly?

22 A. Yes, yes.

23 Q. And this was about a month after Mr. Colborn had  
24 sued Netflix; correct?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. And you're emailing his attorney, Mr. Griesbach,  
2 about the lawsuit here; right?

3 A. Yes. M-hm.

4 Q. And did he respond -- I see he did respond right  
5 above on the same day; correct?

6 A. It looks like it, yes.

7 Q. He says, Yep, I'll generally be keeping mum.

8 A. Oh, okay.

9 Q. And I don't, in any event, he responded, I don't  
10 need to read that out loud --

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. -- to you.

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. Did he ever respond to the notion of including  
15 some behind the scenes access in Convicting?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And what did he say?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Did he say that in an email or over the phone?

20 A. I don't recall if, I, I don't recall, I do not  
21 have record of it in an email, but I mean, let me,  
22 let me think. Just let me see. Mike was the  
23 original attorney before April came on. I was  
24 much more involved at that point. After they came  
25 on, I wasn't involved.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. I handed things over that would help their PI, I  
3 guess, and at that point, no, it was shut down.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. It was shut down, so we never interviewed Mike or  
6 anything like that.

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. We would like to, yes, but, no.

9 Q. The, the notion of including behind the scenes  
10 access in Convicting never got off the ground; is  
11 that what you're saying?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And have you been given access to any of the  
14 documents produced by the defendants in this  
15 case?

16 A. From -- I'm sorry, I don't understand.

17 Q. So if Netflix has produced documents to  
18 Mr. Colborn, for example, as part of this  
19 lawsuit?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Have you been given access to those?

22 A. Sorry. I have not been given any access to  
23 anything from anyone.

24 Q. Has Mr. Colborn told you about any of the  
25 documents that Netflix has produced in this case?

1           feel for them, but I want the truth to be out  
2           there.

3    Q.    Well, you know that this topic, people feel very  
4           passionately about the Avery case; correct?

5    A.    Yes.

6    Q.    There are whole Reddit communities devoted to it;  
7           correct?

8    A.    Oh, absolutely.

9    Q.    And we've talked about some of the unkind emails,  
10          some might say violent emails, Mr. Colborn got.

11   A.    Right.

12   Q.    Are you concerned that that sort of thing, those  
13          sorts of threats and harassment might be directed  
14          at the filmmakers of Making a Murderer when you  
15          release your documentary?

16   A.    I wouldn't be surprised if they were. I've  
17          already had threats and I'm nobody. So I'm not --  
18          I want them, I want the truth to be out there.  
19          I'm not necessarily saying, gee, I hope that  
20          they're inundated. I don't wish that on  
21          anybody.

22   Q.    But you'd agree with me that what the crazy people  
23          out in the world decide to do shouldn't stop  
24          filmmakers from making content?

25                   MR. KURTZ: Objection.



1 Q. Shouldn't stop you from making content; is that  
2 right?

3 A. I'm good with, yes, the clarification with a  
4 documentary that's portrayed in an ethical way.

5 Q. And you have no control over what people who watch  
6 the documentary you're producing do after they  
7 watch it; correct?

8 A. No.

9 MS. BARKER: Objection. Lacks  
10 foundation.

11 Q. All right.

12 (Exhibit [2039](#) marked for identification)

13 Q. So the court reporter just handed you what's been  
14 marked as Exhibit [2039](#). This was a document  
15 produced by Mr. Colborn, Bates No. 4888, and I'll  
16 first ask you, because I know that's not your  
17 signature, if you've ever seen this sort of  
18 document before.

19 A. Yes, I have.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. This is an Appearance Release that Mr. Colborn  
23 signed; correct?

24 A. Yes, yes.

25 Q. And this is an Appearance Release for Convicting a

1 Convicting a Murderer on Netflix?

2 A. I don't think I can answer for him on that, but he  
3 just wants the truth out is how, how I believe he  
4 feels about it. As long as he's not  
5 misrepresented, I don't -- he just wants the world  
6 to know. So I don't know, I don't know.

7 Q. All right. So back to Exhibit [8](#). Did your  
8 attorney hand it to you?

9 MR. KURTZ: I missed that, sorry.  
10 [2008](#).

11 MS. WALKER: Thank you. [2008](#). I knew I  
12 would struggle with that all day, but maybe it  
13 will save us heartache later.

14 Q. So I'll ask you to flip in, oh, five or six pages  
15 to Bates No. 4459.

16 A. All right. Okay.

17 Q. And this is now really early, I guess two years  
18 after the release of Making a Murderer but still  
19 awhile before the lawsuit. Do you see the date  
20 there of December 7th, 2017?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And you text Mr. Colborn. Ugh. Ken just got on  
23 me about my support of the petition. So fucking  
24 frustrating, Andy.

25 Do you see that?

1 A. I do.

2 Q. Is this a reference to Ken Kratz?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. And then you put, From Ken, colon, and I think  
5 what you're doing here is copying a message that  
6 Ken Kratz sent to you; is that right?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And so the message Ken Kratz sent to you says, I  
9 saw your post, Brenda, circulation the petition to  
10 have Netflix cancel making MaM and quit production  
11 on season 2. Not that I necessarily disagree with  
12 your participation in that public position, but  
13 isn't this exactly the kind of decision we all  
14 talk about first? The bottom line is if we ever  
15 hope to secure a movie or series deal, we need MaM  
16 to continue being relevant.

17 Did I read that correctly?

18 A. I believe so.

19 Q. And then you say, and I think you're now talking  
20 in your own voice, Odd how he can drop YouTube  
21 videos about their deceit and do presentations,  
22 but I have to get permission. Whatever.

23 Did I read that correctly?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And then you write, Here's my rely, colon. I

1 think you must have copied to Mr. Colborn what you  
2 had previously sent to Mr. Kratz?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. So what you said to Mr. Kratz was, This is making  
5 them relevant. It's putting their deceit in the  
6 news just like your YouTube videos. Isn't that  
7 what we are fighting for? I shared on my personal  
8 Facebook page support of a petition to stop MAM2.  
9 I think we all know that this isn't stopping  
10 Netflix, but it is showing the masses there's an  
11 issue. That can definitely segue into people  
12 wanting the other side to be told.

13 Did I read that correctly?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. So you agreed with Mr. Kratz that you won't,  
16 quote, need MaM to continue being relevant; was  
17 that correct, in December 2017?

18 MS. BARKER: Objection. Documents speak  
19 for themselves.

20 I don't -- His feeling on it was that if  
21 Making a Murderer was cancelled because of this  
22 petition, that it would ruin his project, okay. I  
23 didn't feel that way. That wasn't why I signed a  
24 petition. I signed a petition because it's what I  
25 believed in. So he was upset with me because I

1 signed that petition publicly knowing that he  
2 could get a film deal, again, not with Convicting,  
3 this was the other one, so he was upset with me  
4 for trying to get Making a Murderer, that I signed  
5 a petition to try and get it cancelled.

6 Q. So if I'm following, Mr. Colborn signed on to work  
7 with Mr. Kratz, and Mr. Kratz was of the view that  
8 if his project was going to succeed, Mr. Kratz  
9 really needed MaM to stay in the news; is that  
10 right?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. And I know those are his words, not yours, but you  
13 did reply, This is making them relevant.

14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yes, m-hm.

16 Q. And if, if MaM had died a quick death in 2016 or  
17 2017, there wouldn't really be a market for  
18 Convicting a Murderer; correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Did you all think about the cost to Mr. Colborn of  
21 keeping MaM in the news?

22 MR. KURTZ: Objection. Vague.  
23 Speculation.

24 A. I didn't, I didn't want to keep them in the news.  
25 My reply to Ken was this is making them relevant

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. Did you ever draft any exhibit to any  
3 Complaint like a comparison, a list of defamatory  
4 statements or a comparison of trial testimony to  
5 what was in Making a Murderer?

6 A. In the first Complaint, yes, I did. The second  
7 Complaint, unless they used something from the  
8 first Complaint, I had nothing to do with the  
9 second when, again, I don't know what you call it,  
10 the Amended Complaint, when April and George came  
11 on. The first one, yes. The first one, yes, I  
12 know I had an exhibit in there.

13 MS. WALKER: Mark this as Exhibit [2070](#).

14 (Exhibit [2070](#) marked for identification)

15 Q. So this is an email string with a lot of signature  
16 block.

17 A. Right.

18 Q. Stuff we can ignore at the end, but if you flip  
19 backwards from that, the first real email at the  
20 bottom of the chain is from Deb Bursik to you  
21 asking if there's a piece of paper regarding the  
22 dispatch call Mr. Colborn received.

23 Do you see that on January 16th, 2019?

24 A. What page are you on?

25 Q. I'm on the 2829.

1 A. Okay.

2 Q. -- a couple texts down, you say, We could have  
3 filmed them walking out of the building.

4 Do you see that?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Out of the hearing, I mean; correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And then in the next text from Colborn, he  
9 clarifies that it was done by Zoom.

10 Do you see that?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And that, quote, They are all, they are playing  
13 COVID to the hilt.

14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Did you encourage Mr. Colborn to file this  
17 lawsuit?

18 MR. KURTZ: Objection. Vague.

19 MS. BARKER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear  
20 that question. Could you read it back.

21 (Question read)

22 A. I encouraged him, told him I would support him  
23 regardless, whether he did or not. He wasn't sure  
24 if he wanted to. It took him a long time to make  
25 that decision until he had to. I told him I would

1           help him any way possible. If I, if I could  
2           provide information that would help his case,  
3           yes.

4    Q.    Did you ever talk to Shawn Rech about  
5           Mr. Colborn's decision to file a lawsuit?

6    A.    Yes, I believe I did, yes.

7    Q.    Okay. Was Shawn Rech supportive?

8    A.    I remember two situations, and they vary. So I  
9           don't know what time frame they were, but one was  
10          once he -- I don't think he wanted him to simply  
11          because he had experience with that, okay. So  
12          that was one time I remember that he knew how, how  
13          lawsuits worked and that he knew what would happen  
14          going through everything. On the other hand, Andy  
15          was, really wanted to do that, so I remember a  
16          conversation about potentially one of Shawn's  
17          partners, not partners, not acquaintances, what is  
18          he, I don't know, friends that was an attorney  
19          that he worked with on prior projects, that he  
20          asked him to, he put him in touch with him, and  
21          nothing became of it because he's not that type of  
22          lawyer is my understanding.

23   Q.    Did you ever talk to Mr. Rech about how  
24          Mr. Colborn's lawsuit might impact Convicting a  
25          Murderer?



- 1     A.     I'm sure it was a discussion that we would have to  
2           include it to some degree, but we weren't able to  
3           film any of it anyway, so it didn't matter. Once  
4           he got the lawyers, it became kind of a completely  
5           moot point. Would I have loved to follow through  
6           this whole process and filmed it, yes, because of  
7           how I felt about everything. I think Shawn was  
8           probably smarter knowing that that would never be  
9           the case.
- 10    Q.     Do you know if Mr. Rech felt like the lawsuit in  
11           any way has stolen the thunder of Convicting a  
12           Murderer and that it'll be old news in some sense  
13           by the time it's released?
- 14    A.     I don't know that the lawsuit would have affected  
15           that he felt our film would be any less valuable.
- 16    Q.     I'm just asking; I don't know.
- 17    A.     Yeah, okay, okay. As far as old news, I mean the  
18           longer you get from anything, sure, I mean things  
19           take time. Do we wish we could have gotten it out  
20           two years ago, absolutely.
- 21    Q.     Do you think this lawsuit is keeping it relevant  
22           so that people will still be paying attention to  
23           Convicting a Murderer when it's released?
- 24    A.     I don't think very many people are paying  
25           attention to this lawsuit so, no.

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)

2 MILWAUKEE COUNTY )

3 I, JANET D. LARSEN, a Notary Public in  
4 and for the State of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that  
5 the deposition of BRENDA SCHULER was taken before me  
6 under and pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil  
7 Procedure on the 20th day of May, 2022.

8 That before said witness testified,  
9 she was first duly sworn by me to testify the truth.

10 That I am not a relative or employee or  
11 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, or a  
12 relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or  
13 financially interested directly or indirectly in this  
14 action.

15 That the foregoing pages are a true and  
16 correct transcription of my original shorthand notes  
17 taken at said time and place.

18

19 Dated this 24th day of May, 2022  
20 at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

21

22 JANET DONALDSON LARSEN  
23 REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER  
24 NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF WISCONSIN  
25 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 1-22-26

24

25

Colleen Reed Reporting LLC  
414.322.3621

## 1 ERRATA SHEET

2

3 Deponent: Brenda Schuler

4 Date: 5-20-22

5 Case: Andrew Colborn v Netflix, Inc., et al

6

7 Page 14 Line 11 Change part. to contract Reason clarification  
 8 Page 39 Line 26 Change 2013 to 2014 Reason clarification  
 9 Page 40 Line 5 Change 2019 to 2020 Reason my error  
 10 Page 47 Line 22-23 Change Jan to March Reason my error  
 11 Page 48 Line 15 Change Mike to Lenk Reason Reporter error  
 12 Page 49 Line 20 Change Within a month to several months Reason my error  
 13 Page 80 Line 1 Change lamb blasted to lambasted Reason Reporter error  
 14 Page 143 Line 12 Change 2005 to 2007 Reason Attorney error  
 15 Page 48 Line 14 Change About him to By Perak Reason my error  
 16 Page 287 Line 1 Change Don't to do Reason my error  
 17 Page 168 Line 17 Change See below Reason context  
 18 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 19 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 20 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 21 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 22 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 23 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 24 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_  
 25 Page \_\_\_ Line \_\_\_ Change \_\_\_ Reason \_\_\_

Colleen Reed Reporting LLC  
 414.322.3621

In regard to 17 above, the question by Ms Walker was taken out of context. She did not reference that my text, "we should shoot all liberal law professors" was in response to an attached article titled something to the effect of "UC Professor thinks all cops should be killed."

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SIGNATURE PAGE

I, Brenda Schuler, do hereby certify that I have read  
the foregoing transcript of proceedings, taken the 20th  
day of May, 2022, and the same is true and correct,  
except for the list of corrections, if any, noted on  
the errata sheet.

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2022

Deponent Signature 

Subscribed and sworn to before me this \_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2022 in \_\_\_\_\_ County  
State of \_\_\_\_\_  
My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Colleen Reed Reporting LLC  
414.322.3621



## SIGNATURE PAGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 I, Brenda Schuler, do hereby certify that I have read  
7 the foregoing transcript of proceedings, taken the 20th  
8 day of May, 2022, and the same is true and correct,  
9 except for the list of corrections, if any, noted on  
10 the errata sheet.

11  
12  
13 Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2022  
14 Deponent Signature Brenda Schuler  
15  
16  
17

18 Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24 day of  
19 JUNE, 2022 in OUTAGAMIE County  
20 State of WISCONSIN  
21 My commission expires: 12-4-23  
22 Notary Public Printed Name: CKORTH  
23 Notary Public Signature CKORTH  
24  
25



Colleen Reed Reporting LLC  
414.322.3621